

AWARD-FEE PLAN

FOR

AIR FORCE PLANT 42 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE CONTRACT

(DATE OF APPROVAL)

(Contractor's Name)

COORDINATED:

APPROVED:

**Aeronautical Systems Center
Director of Contracting**

**Commander,
Aeronautical Systems Center
Fee Determining Official**

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0	Introduction	3
2.0	Organization	4
3.0	Responsibilities	4
4.0	Award-Fee Processes	5
5.0	Award-Fee Plan Change Procedure	6
6.0	Contract Termination	6

Annexes

<u>Annex</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Award-Fee Organization	7
2	Award-Fee Allocation by Evaluation Periods	8
3	Evaluation Criteria	9
3a	Management	9
3b	Engineering Services	11
3c	Telecommunications/Information Management	13
3d	Maintenance	14
3e	Fire Protection	16
3f	Security Guard Force Services	18

AWARD-FEE PLAN

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This award-fee plan details the basis for which the Commander, Detachment 1 Aeronautical Systems Center will perform an evaluation of the Air Force Plant 42 Operations and Maintenance contractor's performance. It also provides the outline for presenting an assessment of that performance to the Fee Determining Official (FDO). The specific criteria and procedures used to assess the contractor's performance and to determine the amount of award fee earned are described herein. All FDO decisions regarding the award fee, including but not limited to: the amount of the award fee, if any; the methodology used to calculate the award fee; the calculation of the award fee; the contractor's entitlement to the award fee; and the nature and success of the contractor's performance, shall not be subject to the "Disputes" clause nor reviewed by any Board of Contract Appeal (BCA), court, or other judicial entity. There is one evaluation period every 6 months for the duration of this contract, except for evaluation period 1, which is 5 months full contractor effort (1 month transition). Award fee periods 1 through 8 have an available award fee pool of 50% of the total award fee pool available for that contract period. Evaluation periods 9 and 10 correspond to contract periods of 6 months. Therefore the award fee pool available for those periods will be 100% of the total award fee pool for that contract period. The award fee pool for each contract period is based on 8% of the price of the operations and maintenance service CLINs, including options, if exercised, for Entry Control Point (ECP), Site 3, and 5 minute security response, for that period. There will be no rollover of any un-awarded fees to a subsequent period. If the Government adjusts the funding level of this effort, then a corresponding and equitable adjustment will be made to the award fee pool. All decisions by the FDO are final (see AFMCFARS 5352.216-9003, Award Fee, Jul 97).

The Award Fee process is recognized to be subjective in nature but every effort will be made to assure fairness. The process is explicit enough to allow the Contractor opportunity to understand how the award amount can be earned. Contractor performance, as assessed by the Performance Monitors and other sources, will form the basis for the award fee earned. Notice of deficiencies in performance will be given in a timely manner wherever such notice is reasonably necessary to ensure Contractor awareness of Government perceptions. Upon fee award, the Government will advise the Contractor of the rationale for the award fee determination.

The award fee will be provided to the contractor through contract modifications and is in addition to the fixed price provisions of the contract. The award fee earned and payable will be determined by the FDO based upon review of the contractor's performance against the criteria set forth in this plan. The FDO may unilaterally change this plan prior to the beginning of an evaluation period. The contractor will be notified in writing of changes to the plan by the Contracting Officer (CO) before the start of the new evaluation period. Changes to this plan that are applicable to a current evaluation period will be incorporated by mutual consent of both parties.

2.0 ORGANIZATION

The award-fee organization consists of: the Fee Determining Official (FDO), an Award Fee Review Board (AFRB) and the performance monitors. The FDO, AFRB members, and performance monitors are listed in Annex 1.

3.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

a. **Fee Determining Official.** The FDO approves the award-fee plan and any significant changes. The FDO reviews the recommendation(s) of the AFRB, considers all pertinent data, determines the earned-award-fee amount for each evaluation period and notifies the contractor in writing of the amount of the fee awarded for the evaluation period, with a description of the Contractor's performance, strengths, and weaknesses. The FDO also appoints the AFRB Chairman and approves the members of the AFRB.

b. **Award Fee Review Board.** The AFRB, as a minimum, consists of a chairman, contracting officer, and recorder. Additional membership may include personnel from key functional organizations. AFRB members review performance monitors' evaluation of the contractor's performance, consider all information from pertinent sources, prepare interim performance reports, and arrive at an earned-award-fee recommendation to be presented to the FDO. The AFRB will also recommend changes to the award fee plan. AFRB membership is listed in Annex 1

c. **AFRB Chairman.** The AFRB chairman conducts the AFRB and acts as the general advisor to the FDO. The AFRB chairman approves minor changes to the award fee plan. that do not require FDO approval.

d. **AFRB Recorder.** The AFRB recorder is responsible for coordinating the administrative actions of the performance monitors, the AFRB and the FDO, including: 1) receipt, processing and distribution of evaluation reports from all required sources; 2) scheduling and assisting with internal evaluation milestones, such as briefings; and 3) accomplishing other actions required to ensure the proper execution operation of the award fee plan.

e. **Contracting Officer.** The CO acts as the liaison between contractor and Government personnel. Transmits the FDO letters to the contractor. Prepares and distributes the modification awarding the fee authorized by the FDO. Notifies the contractor in writing of any change(s) to the award fee plan, after FDO/AFRB Chairperson approval.

f. **Performance Monitors.** Continually evaluate the contractor's performance in specifically assigned areas of responsibility. Provide evaluation inputs and support preparation of the interim report and final evaluation report/briefing which support conclusions reached concerning the contractor's performance. Maintain open, honest, and frequent communication with the Contractor. Recommend changes to the Award Fee Plan.

4.0 AWARD-FEE PROCESSES

a. **Available-Award-Fee Amount.** The available award fee for each evaluation period is shown in Annex 2. The earned award fee will be paid based on the contractor's performance during each evaluation period.

b. **Evaluation Criteria.** The areas of evaluation to be measured are listed in annex 1. They will be measured using the criteria in annex 3. The contractor shall be entitled to receive, in any evaluation period, an Award Fee commensurate with the overall performance rating within the following ranges:

Excellent	91-100%
Very Good	71-90%
Satisfactory	50-70%
Unsatisfactory	zero

If the CO does not give specific notice in writing to the contractor of any change to the evaluation criteria prior to the start of a new evaluation period, then the same criteria listed for the preceding period will be used in the following award-fee evaluation period. Any changes to evaluation criteria will be made by revising Annex 3 and notifying the contractor.

c. **Interim Evaluation Process.** The AFRB Recorder notifies each AFRB member and performance monitor 45 calendar days before the midpoint of the evaluation period. Performance monitors submit their evaluation reports to the AFRB 30 calendar days after this notification. The AFRB reviews the interim evaluation reports, prepares an interim performance evaluation and notifies the contractor of the strengths and weaknesses for the current evaluation period. Further, the interim report provides recommendations for improvements in the weak areas, if any. The CO may also issue letters at any other time when it is deemed necessary to highlight areas of Government concern. This interim report will not result in a determination of an award fee

d. **End-of-Period Evaluations.** The AFRB Recorder notifies each AFRB member and performance monitor 15 calendar days before the end of the evaluation period. Performance monitors submit their evaluation reports to the AFRB 30 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. The AFRB prepares its evaluation report and recommendation for an award fee. The AFRB briefs the evaluation report and recommendation to the FDO within 60 calendar days after the end of the evaluation period. At this time, the AFRB may also recommend any significant changes to the award-fee plan for FDO approval. The FDO determines the overall grade and earned-award-fee amount for the evaluation period within 60 calendar days after each evaluation period. The FDO will provide a letter informing the contractor of the earned-award-fee amount within 90 days after the end of the evaluation period. The CO issues a unilateral contract modification authorizing payment of the earned-award-fee amount within 30 calendar days after notification to the contractor of the FDO's decision. A contractor debrief will be granted upon request.

e. **Contractor's Self-Assessment.** The contractor may submit a written self-evaluation of his performance to the CO within five working days after the end of the evaluation period. This

written assessment by the contractor may be used by the AFRB to assist in the award fee evaluation. The contractor's self-assessment may not exceed 10 single sided pages.

5.0 AWARD-FEE PLAN CHANGE PROCEDURE

All significant changes to the award fee plan will be forwarded to the FDO for approval. The Contractor can also propose changes to this plan. All proposed changes will be evaluated by the AFRB and, if approved, submitted to the FDO for final approval. Minor changes may be approved by the AFRB Chairperson. Upon approval, the CO shall notify the contractor in writing of any change(s). Unilateral changes may be made to the award-fee plan if the contractor is provided written notification by the CO before the start of the upcoming evaluation period. Changes effecting the current evaluation period must be by mutual agreement of both parties.

6.0 CONTRACT TERMINATION

If the contract is terminated for the convenience of the Government after the start of an award-fee evaluation period, any award fee for that period shall be determined by the FDO using the normal award-fee evaluation process. After termination for convenience, the remaining award-fee amounts allocated to all subsequent award-fee evaluation periods cannot be earned by the contractor and, therefore, shall not be paid.

ANNEX 1**AWARD-FEE ORGANIZATION**Members

Fee Determining Official: ASC Commander *ASC/CC*

Award Fee Review Board Chairperson: Chief, Environmental, Safety, and Health Division *ASC/ENV*

Award Fee Review Board Members:

Detachment 1 Commander	<i>Det 1/CC</i>
Contracting Officer	<i>Det 1/CO</i>
Recorder (Plant 42 IPT Administrative Specialist)	<i>ASC/ENVF</i>
Contracting Staff Member	<i>ASC/ENVK</i>
Judge Advocate Staff Member	<i>AFMC LO/JAN</i>
Financial Management Staff Member	<i>ASC/ENVF</i>
Facilities Staff Member	<i>ASC/ENVP</i>

Performance Monitors

<u>Area of Evaluation</u>	<u>Performance Monitor(s)</u>	<u>Weight</u>
Management	<i>Det 1/CD</i>	10%
Technical Operations (Engineering Services)	<i>Det 1/CE</i>	10%
Technical Operations (Telecommunication/Information Management)	<i>Det 1/IM</i>	5%
Technical Operations (Maintenance)	<i>Det 1/LGX</i>	25%
Technical Operations (Fire Protection & Industrial Safety Services)	<i>Det 1/SE</i>	25%
Technical Operations (Security Guard Force Services)	<i>Det 1/SF</i>	25%

ANNEX 2**AWARD-FEE ALLOCATION BY EVALUATION PERIODS**

The award fee earned by the contractor will be determined at the completion of evaluation periods shown below. The percentage shown corresponding to each period is the maximum available-award-fee percentage that can be earned during that particular period.

Evaluation Period	From	To	Available Award Fee for Contract Period*	Associated CLINs **
1	1 Aug 2000	31 Dec 2000	30%	0002, 0006, 0007
2	1 Jan 2001	31 Jun 2001	70%	0002, 0006, 0007
3	1 Jul 2001	31 Dec 2002	50%	0008, 0011, 0012
4	1 Jan 2002	31 Jun 2002	50%	0008, 0011, 0012
5	1 Jul 2002	31 Dec 2003	50%	0013, 0016, 0017
6	1 Jan 2003	31 Jun 2003	50%	0013, 0016, 0017
7	1 Jul 2003	31 Dec 2004	50%	0018, 0021, 0022
8	1 Jan 2004	31 Jun 2004	50%	0018, 0021, 0022
9	1 Jul 2004	31 Dec 2005	100%***	0023, 0026, 0027
10	1 Jan 2005	31 Jun 2005	100%***	0028, 0031, 0032

The contractor will be notified of such changes, if any, in writing by the CO before the relevant period is started and the award-fee plan will be modified accordingly. After an award period begins changes may only be made by mutual agreement of the parties.

* Will be computed in and expressed in dollars in proposal of Final Proposal Revisions (for competition) responses using the percentages shown of associated CLINs.

** 8% of the O&M Service CLIN and options for ECP, Site 3 and 5 minute security response, if exercised, of that contract period.

*** The contract period for evaluation periods 9 and 10 are 6 months in duration.

ANNEX 3a**EVALUATION CRITERIA****Management****UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor failed to identify problems and provide suggested solutions in a timely manner. Solutions, if implemented, had a negative impact on cost and performance of operations. The contractor failed to establish adequate lines of communication to facilitate timely exchange of information, both technical and contractual in order to meet Performance Work Statement (PWS) requirements.
2. The contractor failed to provide qualified personnel with duties, responsibilities and authority necessary to meet PWS requirements in a timely manner. The contractor failed to provide or implement an adequate quality control plan. The contractor failed to take steps to identify or implement commercial practices to improve contractor performance.
3. The contractor failed to provide adequate material resources to meet PWS requirements. The contractor maintained large quantities of overstocked material. The contractor failed to provide a system to control funds expenditures. Information required by Federal Acquisition Regulations (FAR) Part 45 was incomplete or inaccurate.

SATISFACTORY

1. The contractor identified problems and provided suggested solutions in a timely manner. Solutions were implemented with no negative impact on cost and performance of operations. The contractor established adequate lines of communication to provide the ability to exchange information, both technical and contractual in time to meet PWS requirements.
2. The contractor provided qualified personnel with duties, responsibilities and authority necessary to meet PWS requirements. An adequate quality control plan was developed and implemented. The contractor attempted to increase management effectiveness by identifying commercial practices to improve contractor performance.
3. The contractor provided adequate material resources to meet PWS requirements. The contractor maintained minimal quantities of overstocked material. The contractor provided a system to control funds expenditures. Information required by FAR Part 45 was adequate with few errors and re-submittals were not required.

VERY GOOD

1. The contractor identified problems and provided several alternative solutions early in the planning process. Solutions were implemented with a beneficial impact on cost and

performance of operations. Lines of communication facilitated timely exchange of information, both technical and contractual, in order to surpass PWS requirements.

2. The contractor provided qualified personnel with duties, responsibilities, and authority necessary to accomplish PWS requirements ahead of schedule. A quality control plan was developed outlining procedures for quality control and those procedures were implemented with results evident in all activities. The contractor increased management effectiveness by promoting continuous process improvement and incorporating several commercial practices to improve contractor performance.
3. The contractor provided high quality material resources to meet the full needs of the government. The contractor did not maintain any unnecessary material. The contractor provided a well developed system to control funds expenditures and controls over expenditures were effective and consistent. Information required by FAR Part 45 was comprehensive and accurate.

EXCELLENT

1. The contractor practiced proactive management to identify and anticipate problems prior to adverse impact. The contractor provided organized and detailed alternatives including risk assessments; trade off analysis between cost, schedule and performance; action plans; and implementation schedules. Solutions were implemented with positive impact on cost reduction and performance of operations. Lines of communication were well defined, clearly understood, and always facilitated rapid exchange of information both technical and contractual in order to meet PWS requirements.
2. The contractor provided highly qualified personnel with duties, responsibilities, and authority necessary to exceed PWS requirements. Strong corporate involvement in the quality control effort was demonstrated by the establishment of corporate quality measurement methods, and management evaluation of performance. The contractor took steps to increase quality by use of many of the following tools: training, continuous process improvement and self-initiated enhancement techniques. The contractor incorporated best commercial processes into nearly every facet of the operation.
3. The contractor provided high quality material resources in an efficient manner to meet the requirements of the PWS and any anticipated the needs of the government. The contractor maintained no unnecessary material and optimum economies were realized. The contractor provided a complete system for tracking expenditures with great detail to ensure the proper management of government funds. Information required by FAR Part 45 was clear, thorough, and highly accurate.

ANNEX 3b

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Technical Operations
(Engineering)

UNSATISFACTORY

1. The contractor failed to provide adequate engineering documentation to the government. Less than 80% of the engineering documents submitted were acceptable upon submission due to incomplete data, inaccurate information, non-practical technical solutions, or budgetary control.
2. The contractor failed to complete projects under the direction of the engineering department on schedule. Less than 80% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.
3. The engineering department failed to be responsive to the direction or request of the government. Less than 80% of the contractor's responses were submitted within 10 working days of the request.
4. There was no apparent management oversight of the engineering department resulting in continued poor performance.

SATISFACTORY

1. The contractor provided adequate engineering documentation to the government. More than 80% of the engineering documents were acceptable upon submission.
2. The timeliness of completion of projects under the direction of the engineering department was adequate. More than 80% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.
3. The engineering department's responsiveness to the direction or request of the government was adequate. More than 80% of the contractor's responses were submitted within 10 working days of the request.
4. There was adequate management oversight of the engineering department resulting in satisfactory performance.

VERY GOOD

1. The engineering documentation provided by the contractor was commendable. More than 90% of the submittals were acceptable upon submission.
2. The timeliness of completion of projects under the direction of the engineering department was commendable. More than 90% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.

3. The Engineering Department was very responsive to the direction and requests of the government. More than 95% of the contractor's responses were submitted within 10 working days.
4. There was evidence of management oversight down to the working level resulting in commendable performance throughout the engineering department.

EXCELLENT

1. The engineering documentation provided by the contractor was exceptional. More than 95% of the submittals were acceptable upon submission.
2. The timeliness of completion of projects under the direction of the engineering department was exceptional. More than 95% of the projects were completed on or ahead of schedule.
3. The engineering department's responsiveness to the direction or request of the government was exceptional. 100% of the contractor's responses were submitted within 10 working days.
4. There was distinct management oversight in all areas of the engineering department resulting in exceptional performance.

ANNEX 3c**EVALUATION CRITERIA****Technical Operations**

(Telecommunications/Information Management)

UNSATISFACTORY

1. The contractor failed to provide adequate technical support and maintenance of telecommunications/information management equipment. The contractor failed to perform modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor failed to perform inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services as required. Continuous quality assurance surveillance was required by the government.

SATISFACTORY

1. The contractor provided adequate technical support and maintenance of telecommunications/information management equipment. The contractor adequately performed required modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor adequately performed inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services. Continuous quality assurance surveillance was required by the government.

VERY GOOD

1. The contractor developed a schedule to ensure technical support and maintenance of telecommunications/information management equipment was conducted to optimize use of existing equipment. The contractor developed a long term plan to perform modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor performed inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services in a professional and responsive manner. Limited quality assurance surveillance was required by the government.

EXCELLENT

1. The contractor developed and implemented a preventative maintenance plan providing exceptional technical support and maintenance of telecommunications/information management equipment. The contractor integrated the maintenance plan with a long term plan to perform modifications, upgrades, and/or enhancements to hardware and software to maintain the AF Plant 42 office automation systems and local area network. The contractor provided outstanding inter-plant mail, courier, and photographic services in a very professional manner. On several occasions the contractor provided personnel to accommodate short notice requirements for courier and photographic services. Quality assurance surveillance was not required by the government.

ANNEX 3d**EVALUATION CRITERIA****Technical Operations
(Maintenance)****UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor failed to provide adequate technical support, preventative maintenance and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders and holding areas. The contractor failed to adequately perform all operations necessary to accomplish the maintenance, preservation and repair of buildings and structures in the common area in accordance with PWS requirements, industry standards, state requirements and the manufacturer's recommendations. The contractor failed to adequately perform all operations necessary to develop and carry out a plan for grounds maintenance and the control of animals to include birds that could constitute a hazard to flight operations. Continuous quality assurance surveillance was required by the government.

SATISFACTORY

1. The contractor provided adequate technical support, maintenance and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders and holding areas. The contractor adequately performed all operations necessary to accomplish the maintenance, preservation and repair of buildings and structures in the common area in accordance with PWS requirements, industry standards, state requirements and the manufacturer's recommendations. The contractor adequately performed PWS requirements necessary to develop and carry out a plan for grounds maintenance and the control of animals to include birds that could constitute a hazard to flight operations. Minor quality assurance surveillance was required by the government.

VERY GOOD

1. The contractor provided commendable technical support, maintenance, and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders and holding areas. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to accomplish the maintenance, preservation and repair of buildings and structures on the common area in accordance with PWS requirements, industry standards, state requirements and the manufacturer's recommendations was commendable. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements necessary to accomplish grounds maintenance and the control of animals to include a Bird Air Strike Hazard (BASH) Program to control birds that could constitute a hazard to flight operations was commendable. The contractor demonstrated significant forethought to plan for and carry out a comprehensive preventative maintenance program. Limited quality assurance surveillance was required by the government.

EXCELLENT

1. The contractor provided exceptional technical support, maintenance, and repair of the airfield lighting and pavement areas, including taxiways, overruns, aprons, hardstands, shoulders and holding areas. The contractor's performance of all operations necessary to accomplish the maintenance, preservation and repair of buildings and structures in the common area in accordance with PWS requirements, industry standards, state requirements and the manufacturer's recommendations was exceptional. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements necessary to accomplish grounds maintenance and the control of animals to include a BASH program to control birds that could constitute a hazard to flight operations was exceptional. The contractor was extremely proactive suggesting improvements and developing a plan to carry out a comprehensive preventative maintenance program. Quality assurance surveillance was not required by the government

ANNEX 3e**EVALUATION CRITERIA****Technical Operations**
(Fire Protection)**UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor's performance failed to meet PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services. Contractor personnel assigned to Fire Protection Service duties failed to possess required equipment or perform duties to a level commensurate with PWS requirements. The contractor failed to develop an adequate training and standardization evaluation program. The contractor failed to establish an adequate Fire Alarm Communication Section. The contractor failed to establish adequate Fire Alarm monitoring procedures or Facility Fire Inspection procedures. The contractor failed to maintain adequate control over Government Furnished Property (GFP) and Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) assigned to the Fire Service. Continuous quality assurance surveillance was required by the government
2. The contractor failed to provide adequate documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Discrepancies were major and required extensive time and effort to correct.

SATISFACTORY

1. The contractor's performance met PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services. Contractor personnel assigned to Fire Protection Service duties possessed required equipment and performed duties to a level commensurate with PWS requirements. The contractor developed an adequate training and standardization evaluation program. The contractor established an adequate Fire Alarm Communication Section. The contractor established adequate Fire Alarm monitoring procedures and Facility Fire Inspection procedures. The contractor maintained adequate control over Government Furnished Property (GFP) and Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) assigned to the Fire Service. Considerable quality assurance surveillance was required by the government
2. The contractor provided adequate documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Technical discrepancies were minor and took limited time and effort to correct.

VERY GOOD

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services was commendable. Contractor personnel assigned to Fire Protection Service duties possessed required equipment continuously maintained in a ready state. The contractor developed a commendable training and standardization evaluation program. Personnel assigned were well trained and performed duties in excess of those required by the PWS. The contractor established a commendable Fire Alarm Communication Section. The contractor established commendable Fire Alarm monitoring procedures and Facility Fire Inspection procedures. The contractor maintained commendable control over Government Furnished Property (GFP) and Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) assigned to the Fire Service. Limited quality assurance surveillance was required by the government.
2. The contractor provided extensive documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data with few administrative discrepancies.

EXCELLENT

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements for Fire Protection Services was exceptional. The contractor made every effort possible to continually upgrade fire protection equipment and the equipment on hand was continuously maintained in a ready state. The contractor developed a first class training and standardization evaluation program. Personnel assigned were professional and exceptionally well trained. The contractor established a highly productive Fire Alarm Communication Section. The contractor developed exceptional, Fire Alarm monitoring procedures and Facility Fire Inspection procedures. The contractor maintained extraordinary control over Government Furnished Property (GFP) and Government Furnished Equipment (GFE) assigned to the Fire Service. The contractor took a pro-active approach. Quality assurance surveillance was not required by the government.
2. The contractor provided extensive documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data with no discrepancies. All were in a format that was complete, clear, concise, technically accurate and easily understood.

ANNEX 3f**EVALUATION CRITERIA****Technical Operations**
(Security Guard Force Services)**UNSATISFACTORY**

1. The contractor's performance failed to meet PWS requirements. Serious problems existed for which the contractors corrective actions were ineffective. Contractor personnel, assigned to Security Guard Force duties failed to present a professional image, possess required equipment, or possess the knowledge to perform duties to a level commensurate with the Security Forces Procedures Manual. The contractor failed to establish an adequate training and standardization evaluation program to meet the requirements of the PWS. The contractor failed to establish a Pass and Registration Section and a Reports and Analysis Section to meet PWS requirements. The contractor failed to maintain adequate control over government issued weapons/ammunition.
2. The contractor failed to provide adequate documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Discrepancies were major and required extensive time and effort to correct.

SATISFACTORY

1. The contractor's performance met PWS requirements. Minor discrepancies, identified by government surveillance existed. Corrective actions taken by the contractor were satisfactory. Contractor personnel, assigned to Security Guard Force duties, presented a professional image, possessed required equipment, and possessed the knowledge to perform duties to a level commensurate with the Security Forces Procedures Manual. The contractor established an adequate training and standardization evaluation program to meet PWS requirements. The contractor established a Pass and Registration Section and a Reports and Analysis Section to meet PWS requirements. The contractor maintained adequate control over government issued weapons/ammunition.
2. The contractor provided adequate documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS. Technical discrepancies were minor and took limited time and effort to correct.

VERY GOOD

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements was commendable. Limited quality assurance surveillance was required by the government. Some minor problems existed for which contractor developed corrective actions were highly effective. Contractor personnel, assigned to Security Guard Force duties, presented a very professional image, possessed required equipment continuously maintained in a ready state, were well trained, and

performed duties in excess of those required by the PWS. The contractor established a commendable training and standardization evaluation. The contractor established a commendable Pass and Registration Section and Reports and Analysis Section.. The contractor maintained commendable control over government issued weapons/ammunition.

2. The contractor provided extensive documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data required by the PWS with few administrative discrepancies.

EXCELLENT

1. The contractor's performance of PWS requirements was exceptional. The contractor took a pro-active approach. Quality assurance surveillance was not required by the government. Contractor personnel assigned to Security Guard Force duties presented a highly professional image. The contractor made every effort possible to continuously upgrade security equipment and the equipment on-hand was continuously maintained in a ready state. The contractor established an extensive training and standardization evaluation program far exceeding PWS requirements. Assigned personnel were exceptionally well trained. The contractor established a highly productive Pass and Registration Section and Reports and Analysis Section far exceeding PWS requirements. The contractor maintained exceptional control over government issued weapons/ammunition.
2. The contractor provided extensive documentation in the form of technical/periodic reports and other deliverable data with no discrepancies. All were in a format that was complete, clear, concise, technically accurate and easily understood.